

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 9, 15, and 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; however, as explained below, Applicants submit that all claims 1-26 are allowable.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-22, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuzawa et al. (US 6,459,193) ("Fukuzawa") in combination with Tonucci et al. (US 6,087,274) ("Tonucci"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10 include the following limitation: "causing relative movement between said mask and said layer material source, and said substrate." Fukuzawa and Tonucci do not teach or suggest that limitation.

The Examiner acknowledges that Fukuzawa does not teach or suggest relative movement between the mask and the layer material, and the substrate. The Examiner asserts that Tonucci teaches the relative movement of the mask and the substrate. However, claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10 require causing relative movement between said mask and said layer material source, and said substrate. Tonucci does not have any description related to a layer material source. At most, Tonucci states that a conductive material is deposited using a source with a partially divergent flux. See column 6, lines 19-20. There is no other discussion in Tonucci regarding a layer material source. In addition, there is no discussion of the relative movement of the layer material source. As such, Fukuzawa and

YK1-0078
09/066,692

Tonucci do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11-14, 16-22, and 24 include the following limitation: "sliding a relative position between said mask and said emissive material source." Fukuzawa and Tonucci do not teach or suggest that limitation.

As stated above, the Examiner acknowledges that Fukuzawa does not teach or suggest relative movement between the mask and the layer material, and the substrate. The Examiner asserts that Tonucci teaches relative movement of the mask and the substrate. However, claims 11-14, 16-22, and 24 require sliding a relative position between said mask and said emissive material source. Tonucci does not have any description related to an emissive material source. At most, Tonucci states that a conductive material is deposited using a source with a partially divergent flux. See column 6, lines 19-20. There is no other discussion in Tonucci regarding an emissive material source or sliding a relative position between the mask and the emissive material source. As such, Fukuzawa and Tonucci do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 25-26 include the following limitation: "sliding a relative position between said emissive material source and said substrate." As explained above, Tonucci does not have any description related to an emissive material source. As such, there is not description regarding sliding a relative position between the emissive material source and the substrate. As such, Fukuzawa and Tonucci do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

YKI-0078
09/066,692

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovi

Registration No. 48,933

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

April 17, 2003

FAX RECEIVED

APR 17 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

YKI-0078
09/966,692